arXiv:1704.06521v1 [math.ST] 21 Apr 2017

Functional Erdős-Rényi laws for Levy processes

Dimbihery Rabenoro
Laboratoire de Statistique Théorique et Appliquée, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, France

Abstract

In this paper we present a functional form of the Erdős-Rényi law of large numbers for Levy processes.

Keywords Levy processes, Functional large deviations, Erdős-Rényi laws.

1 Introduction

Let $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ be a random process with stationary and independent increments, fulfilling $Z(0) = 0$ and such that the sample paths of $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ are right-continuous with left-hand limits. Thus it is a Levy process (see (Bertoin, 1998)). For $x \geq 0$, and $l > 0$, let $\gamma_{x,l}(\cdot)$ be the increment functions, defined by

$$\gamma_{x,l}(s) := Z(x + ls) - Z(x) \quad \text{for } s \in [0, 1]. \tag{1.1}$$

Let A_T be a function of T such that A_T and TA_T^{-1} are non-decreasing, and $0 < A_T \leq T$. For some scaling functions B_T, we study the limiting behavior, as $T \to \infty$, of the sets $\mathcal{H}_T$ defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_T := \left\{ \frac{\gamma_{x,A_t}(\cdot)}{B_T} : 0 \leq x \leq T - A_T \right\} \tag{1.2}$$

In this purpose, we need to define in which sense $\mathcal{H}_T$ converges to some deterministic set of functions. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a space of functions defined on $[0, 1]$, containing $\mathcal{H}_T$. Let d be a distance on $\mathcal{E}$. For any subset A of $\mathcal{E}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, set

$$A^\epsilon := \{g \in \mathcal{E} : d(f, g) < \epsilon \text{ for some } f \in A\} \tag{1.3}$$

The Hausdorff distance between subsets of $\mathcal{E}$ is defined for any $A, B \subset \mathcal{E}$ by

$$\Delta(A, B) := \inf \{\epsilon > 0 : A \subset B^\epsilon \text{ and } B \subset A^\epsilon\} \tag{1.4}$$

Then, a functional limit theorem for $\mathcal{H}_T$ is the statement that for some subset K of $\mathcal{E}$, we have :

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \Delta(\mathcal{H}_T, K) = 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{1.5}$$

Remark 1. *The following statements are equivalent :*
i) $\lim_{T\to\infty} \Delta(\mathcal{H}_T, K) = 0$
ii) For any $\epsilon > 0$*, there exists* $T(\epsilon)$ *such that for all* $T \geq T(\epsilon)$ *:*

$$\mathcal{H}_T \subset K^\epsilon \text{ and } K \subset (\mathcal{H}_T)^\epsilon. \tag{1.6}$$

For large increments A_T (that is $A_T/\log T \to \infty$ as $T \to \infty$), we give below a first result describing the limiting behavior of $\mathcal{H}_T$, for a suitable choice of B_T. Let $B[0,1]$ be the set of bounded functions on $[0,1]$, which contains $\mathcal{H}_T$. We consider on $B[0,1]$ the uniform distance $d_{\mathcal{U}}$ defined by $d_{\mathcal{U}}(f,g) = \| f - g \|$, where $\| f \| = \sup_{0\le s\le 1} |f(s)|$. Denote by $\Delta_{\mathcal{U}}$ the Hausdorff distance associated to $d_{\mathcal{U}}$. Consider the Strassen-type set

$$\mathbb{S} := \{f \in C[0,1] : f(0) = 0 \text{ and } I_W(f) \le 1\}, \tag{1.7}$$

where the functional I_W on $B[0,1]$ is defined by

$$I_W(f) = \int_0^1 \dot{f}(s)^2 ds \text{ if } f \text{ is absolutely continuous on } [0,1] \text{ and } I_W(f) = 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

Lemma 1. *Assume that $A_T/\log T \to \infty$ and $\frac{\log(T/A_T)}{\log(\log(T))} \to \infty$ as $T \to \infty$. Suppose that for all $t \ge 0$, $E[Z(t)] = 0$ and $Var[Z(t)] = t$. Furthermore, for some $\epsilon > 0$, $\Phi(u) := \mathbb{E}[\exp(uZ(1))] < \infty$ for $|u| \le \epsilon$. Then, setting $B_T := [2A_T\left(\log(TA_T^{-1}) + \log(\log T)\right)]^{1/2}$, we have :*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \Delta_{\mathcal{U}}\left(\mathcal{F}_T, \mathbb{S}\right) = 0 \ \ a.s. \tag{1.8}$$

Proof. Let $\{W(t) : t \ge 0\}$ be a standard Wiener process. Denote by $\mathcal{F}_T^W$ the set $\mathcal{F}_T$, when the Levy process is $Z = W$. Then, under these assumptions on A_T, it is obtained in (Revesz, 1979) that :

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \Delta_{\mathcal{U}}\left(\mathcal{F}_T^W, \mathbb{S}\right) = 0 \text{ a.s.} \tag{1.9}$$

Now, under the assumptions on $E[Z(t)], Var[Z(t)]$ and Φ we have the strong invariance principle for processes with stationary and independent increments (see, e.g., (Deheuvels and Mason, 1993)). Consequently, there exists a probability space on which we can define a standard Wiener process $\{W(t) : t \ge 0\}$ such that :

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} |Z(t) - W(t)| = \mathcal{O}(\log T) \text{ almost surely as } T \to \infty. \tag{1.10}$$

In view of Remark 1, and combining (1.9) and (1.10), we conclude the proof. □

In this paper, we investigate the case of small increments, that is A_T of order $\log T$. In this case, invariance principles can not be applied, since the error bound in (1.10) is precisely of order $\log T$. For small increments A_T, we say that we are in the range of the Erdős-Rényi laws, for which many results have been obtained in the case of the processes of partial sums of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables (r.v.'s). Now, the behaviour of processes with stationary and independent increments is similar in many ways to that of partial sum processes. Therefore we recall hereafter the main results of functional Erdős-Rényi laws obtained in the literature. Considering a sequence $\{X_n : n \ge 1\}$ of i.i.d. random variables, the partial sum process $\{S(t) : t \ge 0\}$ is defined by

$$S(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor t \rfloor} X_i \text{ where} \lfloor t \rfloor \text{ is the integer part of } t. \tag{1.11}$$

In this setting, the scaling function of T is $B_T = A_T$. We recall that, given a r.v. X, its moment-generating function (mgf) Φ_X is defined for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ by $\Phi_X(t) := E[\exp(tX)]$. Denote by Ψ_X the Legendre transform of Φ_X (or the Chernoff function of $Z(\cdot)$, see (Chernoff, 1952)), namely $\Psi_X(a) :=$

$\sup_{\{t:\Phi_X(t)<\infty\}} [at - \log \Phi_X(t)]$, for $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Setting $t_1 := \inf\{t : \Phi_X(t) < \infty\}$ and $t_0 := \sup\{t : \Phi_X(t) < \infty\}$, we have (see (Deheuvels, 2007)) :

$$t_1 = \lim_{\alpha \to -\infty} \frac{\Psi_X(\alpha)}{\alpha} \text{ and } t_0 = \lim_{\alpha \to \infty} \frac{\Psi_X(\alpha)}{\alpha} \tag{1.12}$$

Then, we consider the following assumptions, which are standard in large deviations theory.

$$(\mathcal{C}_X) : \Phi_X(t) \text{ is finite for any real } t, \text{ that is } t_1 = -\infty \text{ and } t_0 = \infty.$$

$$(\mathcal{A}_X) : \Phi_X(\cdot) \text{ is finite in a neighborhood of the origin, that is } t_1 < 0 < t_0.$$

Now, the law of $\{S(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is fully determined by that of $X := X_1$. Under $(\mathcal{C}_{X_1})$, (Borovkov, 1990) and (Sanchis, 1994) obtain a functional Erdős-Rényi law for piecewise affine processes constructed from $S(\cdot)$ as follows. For integers $i \geq 0$ and $k > 0$, set

$$s_{i,k}(t) := \frac{S(i + \lfloor kt \rfloor) - S(i) + (kt - \lfloor kt \rfloor) X_{i+\lfloor kt \rfloor + 1}}{k} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1. \tag{1.13}$$

For any integers n and k with $0 < k \leq n$, the set $M_{n,k} := \{s_{i,k} : 0 \leq i \leq n - k\}$ is therefore included in C^0, the space of continuous functions on $[0, 1]$ which vanish at 0. Now, for any $v > 0$, introduce the set

$$K_v := \left\{ f \in C^0 : I_X(f) \leq v \right\}, \tag{1.14}$$

where I_X is the functional defined on C^0 by

$$I_X(f) = \int_0^1 \Psi_X\left(\frac{df}{ds}(s)\right) ds \tag{1.15}$$

The following theorem is obtained in (Borovkov, 1990) by quite analytical methods (but it still holds when considering random vectors X_n). In (Sanchis, 1994), the same theorem is obtained from functional large deviations results.

Theorem 1. *Under $(\mathcal{C}_{X_1})$, for any $c > 0$ and $k = \lfloor c \log n \rfloor$, we have*

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \Delta_{\mathcal{U}}\left(M_{n,k}, K_{1/c}\right) = 0 \qquad a.s. \tag{1.16}$$

In (Deheuvels, 1991), results of that type are obtained under much more general conditions. Firstly, the paths of $\{S(t) : t \geq 0\}$ are considered directly. Secondly, the main results are obtained under $(\mathcal{A}_{X_1})$. Finally, the assumption of small increments A_T consist of the existence of a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{A_T}{\log T} = c. \tag{1.17}$$

For such a c, let $\mathcal{F}_{T,c}$ be the set of Erdős-Rényi-type increment functions of $\{S(t) : t \geq 0\}$, defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_{T,c} := \{c\xi_{x,T} : 0 \leq x \leq T - A_T\} \quad \text{where} \quad \xi_{x,T}(s) := \frac{S(x + sA_T) - S(x)}{A_T} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq s \leq 1. \tag{1.18}$$

Then $\mathcal{F}_{T,c}$ is included in $BV(0, 1)$, the set of right-continuous functions on $[0, 1]$ with bounded variations. Thus, $BV(0, 1)$ is the space of distribution functions of totally bounded signed measures on $[0, 1]$. In

the sequel, we will identify $f \in BV(0,1)$ with the signed measure μ_f such that $df = \mu_f$. We consider on $BV(0,1)$ the distance $d_{\mathcal{W}}$ defined below and we denote by $\Delta_{\mathcal{W}}$ the associated Hausdorff distance.

$$d_{\mathcal{W}}(f,g) = \int_0^1 |f(u) - g(u)|du + |f(1) - g(1)|. \tag{1.19}$$

For $f \in BV(0,1)$, let $f = f_+ - f_-$ be its Hahn-Jordan decomposition. For $p \in BV(0,1)$, let $p = p^A + p^S$ be its Lebesgue decomposition with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Then, we define the functionals J_X and $J_{X,c}$ on $BV(0,1)$ by

$$J_X(f) = \int_0^1 \Psi_X\left(\frac{d}{ds}f^A(s)\right)ds + t_0 f_+^S(1) - t_1 f_-^S(1) \qquad \text{and} \qquad J_{X,c}(f) := cJ_X\left(\frac{f}{c}\right) \tag{1.20}$$

Then, set

$$D_c := \{f \in BV(0,1) : J_{X,c}(f) \leq 1\} \tag{1.21}$$

The two following theorems are obtained in (Deheuvels, 1991).

Theorem 2. *Assume that X is centered, of finite variance and nondegenerate. Assume further that $A_T/\log T \to c \in (0,\infty)$ as $T \to \infty$. Then, under $(\mathcal{A}_{X_1})$, we have :*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \Delta_{\mathcal{W}}\left(\mathcal{F}_{T,c}, D_c\right) = 0 \qquad a.s. \tag{1.22}$$

Theorem 3. *Suppose that the assumptions of the latter Theorem hold. Then, under $(\mathcal{C}_{X_1})$, we have :*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \Delta_{\mathcal{U}}\left(\mathcal{F}_{T,c}, D_c\right) = 0 \qquad a.s. \tag{1.23}$$

As expected, we obtain analogue results for Levy processes. So we need to introduce more notations, specific to small increments. For $x \geq 0$, and $l > 0$, let $\eta_{x,l}(\cdot)$ be the standardized increment functions, defined by

$$\eta_{x,l}(s) := \frac{Z(x+ls) - Z(x)}{l} \quad \text{for } s \in [0,1]. \tag{1.24}$$

The small increments A_T which we consider are of the form $A_T = c\log T$, for some $c > 0$. We obtain results on the limiting behavior of the set $\mathcal{G}_T$ of Erdős-Rényi-type increment functions defined by

$$\mathcal{G}_T := \{\eta_{x,A_T} : 0 \leq x \leq T - A_T\}. \tag{1.25}$$

More precisely, we obtain a functional Erdős-Rényi theorem for $\mathcal{G}_T$, under $\left(\mathcal{C}_{Z(1)}\right)$ and additional assumptions, with limiting set denoted by K. The first part of the proof follows that of Theorem 2 hereabove (Theorem 3.1. in (Deheuvels, 1991)), that is, setting $a_n := \lfloor c\log(n) \rfloor$, we prove that $M_{n,a_n} := \{\eta_{m,a_n} : m \in \{0,...,n-a_n\}\}$ is almost surely ultimately included in K^ϵ, for any $\epsilon > 0$. Then, the difference with the case of the process $\{S(t) : t \geq 0\}$ lies in the fact that for any $x \geq 0$, we have $S(x) = S(\lfloor x \rfloor)$, which does not hold for $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$. To handle this, we prove that under either $\left(\mathcal{C}_{Z(1)}\right)$, the η_{x,a_n} are close enough to η_{i_x,a_n}, where i_x is the integer which is nearest to x. We are clearly reduced to control the oscillations of $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ on a fixed interval, namely we need to control $\sup_{0\leq a\leq \frac{1}{2}} |Z(x+a) - Z(x)|$. This is essentially insured by the assumptions on the mgf of $Z(1)$, which imply that the distributions of the $Z(t)$, for $t \geq 0$ have light tails. The reverse inclusion is rather standard, that is for any $\epsilon > 0$, $K \subset \mathcal{G}_T^\epsilon$ almost surely for all T large enough.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some general results on Levy processes. The main result is given in Section 3 and the proof in Section 4. For the sake of better readability, some more technical results are deferred to the Appendix.

2 General results

2.1 Levy Processes

Let $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ be a Levy process. The analogies between the structure of $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ and that of $\{S(t) : t \geq 0\}$ are essentially due to the fact that the distribution of $Z(1)$ is infinitely divisible. More precisely, the structure of $Z(1)$ determines a unique triple (a, σ^2, π) (called a Levy triple) where $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma^2 \geq 0$ and π is a measure on $\mathbb{R} - \{0\}$ with $\int \min\left\{x^2, 1\right\} \pi(dx) < \infty$, called the levy measure. This triple characterizes the distribution of $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ in the sense that given a Levy triple, one can construct a Levy process such that its distribution is uniquely determined by the given triple. The proof of this fact (see (Bertoin, 1998)) implies the Levy-Itô decomposition, that is $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ can be expressed as

$$Z(t) = Z^{(1)}(t) + Z^{(2)}(t) + Z^{(3)}(t), \tag{2.1}$$

where $Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)}$ and $Z^{(3)}$ are three independent stochastic processes described hereafter. $Z^{(1)}$ is a Wiener process with linear drift, that is $Z^{(1)}(t) = \sigma B_t - at$, where B_t is a standard Brownian motion. $Z^{(2)}$ is a compound Poisson process and $Z^{(3)}$ is a square integrable martingale, both defined through π. Consequently, the distribution of $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is fully determined by that of $Z(1)$, which is itself characterized by its mgf denoted by Φ. Denote by Ψ the Legendre transform of Φ. In the sequel, we denote the assumption $(\mathcal{C}_{Z(1)})$ by $(\mathcal{C})$. Our main results rely heavily on a large deviations principle (LDP) of the distributions $(P_\lambda)_{\lambda>0}$ of the processes $\{Z_\lambda(t) : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$, defined by

$$Z_\lambda(t) := \frac{1}{\lambda} Z(\lambda t), \tag{2.2}$$

By definition of a Levy process, for any $\lambda > 0$, the paths of $\{Z_\lambda(t) : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ lie in $D(0,1)$, the space of right-continuous with left-hand limits functions on $[0,1]$. We may endow $D(0,1)$ with the uniform topology $\mathcal{U}$ or with the Skorohod topology $\mathcal{S}$. We recall from (Billingsley, 1999) that the Skohorod topology $\mathcal{S}$ on $D(0,1)$ is induced by the distance $d_{\mathcal{S}}$ defined by

$$d_{\mathcal{S}}(f,g) = \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda} \{\|\nu - I\| \vee \|f - g.\nu\|\} \tag{2.3}$$

Then, under $(\mathcal{C})$, the distributions $(P_\lambda)_{\lambda>0}$ satisfy a LDP in the Skohorod space $(D(0,1), \mathcal{S})$. This statement is precised in Theorem 4 hereunder.

2.2 Functional large deviations

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a topological space, endowed with a topology $\mathcal{T}$ and its Borel σ-algebra, denoted by $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Definition 1. *A function $I : \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a rate function if I is lower semicontinuous. Furthermore, we say that I is a good rate function if for all $\alpha < \infty$, the level set $K_I(\alpha) := \{f \in \mathcal{E} : I(f) \leq \alpha\}$ is compact. We say that a family of probability measures $(P_\lambda)_{\lambda \geq 0}$ on $\mathcal{T}$ satisfies a Large Deviation Principle (LDP) with rate function I if for any closed (resp. open) subset F (resp. G) of $\mathcal{T}$, we have :*

$$\overline{\lim_{\lambda \to \infty}} \ \frac{1}{\lambda} \log P_\lambda(F) \leq -I(F) \qquad \textit{(upper bound)} \tag{2.4}$$

$$\underline{\lim_{\lambda \to \infty}} \ \frac{1}{\lambda} \log P_\lambda(G) \geq -I(G) \qquad \textit{(lower bound)} \tag{2.5}$$

where for any non-empty subset A of $\mathcal{E}$, $I(A) := \inf_{f \in A} I(f)$.

First, we have the following general result.

Lemma 2. *Let $(\mathcal{E}, d)$ be a metric space. Let I be a good rate function on $(\mathcal{E}, d)$. Then, for all positive α and ϵ, we have :*

$$\inf_{f \notin (K_\alpha)^\epsilon} I(f) > \alpha \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. We follow the lines of the proof of Lemma 2.1 in (Sanchis, 1994). Suppose that $I((K_\alpha^\epsilon)^c) = \alpha$. Then there's a sequence (x_n) with $x_n \notin (K_\alpha)^\epsilon$ for all n, such that $I(x_n) \searrow \alpha$. For some N and all $n \geq N$, we have $I(x_n) \leq \alpha + 1$, so that $x_n \in \{x \in \mathcal{E} : J(x) \leq \alpha + 1\}$, which is a compact set. Hence, $(x_n)_{n \geq N}$ has a convergent subsequence $x_{n_k} \to x$, as $k \to \infty$. Since I is lower semicontinuous, we have that $I(x) \leq \lim_{k \to \infty} I(x_{n_k}) = \alpha$. Therefore, $x \in K_\alpha$. Now, for all n, $x_n \notin (K_\alpha)^\epsilon$, so that $d(x_n, x) \geq \epsilon$, which leads to a contradiction. □

Let I be the functional defined on $D[0,1]$, by :

$$I(f) = \int_0^1 \Psi(\dot{f}(u))du \text{ if } f \text{ is absolutely continuous and } f(0) = 0$$

$$I(f) = \infty \text{ otherwise.}$$

Lemma 3. *Under $(\mathcal{C})$, I is a good rate function.*

Proof. Since $I(f) = \infty$ whenever $f \notin AC(0,1)$, we obtain that for any $\alpha > 0$, $K_I(\alpha) := \{f \in D(0,1) : I(f) \leq \alpha\} = \{f \in AC(0,1) : I(f) \leq \alpha\}$. Now, since $(\mathcal{C})$ holds, Theorem 1.1. in (Deheuvels, 2007) implies that the set $\{f \in AC(0,1) : I(f) \leq \alpha\}$ is a compact subset of $(C(0,1), \mathcal{U})$. We conclude by recalling that the restriction of $\mathcal{S}$ to $C(0,1)$ coincides there with $\mathcal{U}$, which implies that a compact subset of $(C(0,1), \mathcal{U})$ is also a compact subset of $(D(0,1), \mathcal{S})$. □

Theorem 4. *Under $(\mathcal{C})$, the distributions $(P_\lambda)_{\lambda > 0}$ satisfy a LDP in $(D(0,1), \mathcal{S})$, with rate function I.*

Proof. See (Varadhan, 1966). □

3 Functional Erdős-Rényi theorem

3.1 Main result

We consider the following assummption.

$$(\mathcal{E}) : \text{There exists a constant } \mu \text{ such that for all } t \geq 0, \mathbb{E}[Z(t)] = \mu t.$$

The next theorem, called Erdős-Rényi functional laws (ERFL), is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 5. *Assume that $(\mathcal{C})$ and $(\mathcal{E})$ hold. For $c > 0$, set*

$$K_{1/c} := \{f \in D(0,1) : I(f) \leq 1/c\}, \tag{3.1}$$

where I is the rate function defined in Section 2. Then, for any $c > 0$ and $A_T = c \log(T)$, we have

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \Delta_{\mathcal{U}} \left(\mathcal{G}_T, K_{1/c} \right) = 0 \quad a.s. \tag{3.2}$$

Remark 2. *Let $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ be a Levy process. For any real μ, define the Levy process $\left\{Z^{(\mu)}(t) : t \geq 0\right\}$ by*

$$Z^{(\mu)}(t) := Z(t) + \mu t, \text{ for } t \geq 0. \tag{3.3}$$

If an ERFL holds for $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$, then an ERFL holds also for $\left\{Z^{(\mu)}(t) : t \geq 0\right\}$ (See details in Appendix). We deduce that we can assume in our proofs that the process $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is centered, that is $(\mathcal{E})$ is satisfied with $\mu = 0$.

The following fact provides usually applications to functional limit theorems.

Fact 1. *Let $\Theta : (\mathcal{E}, d) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous map. Assume that $\lim_{T\to\infty} \Delta(\mathcal{G}_T, K) = 0$, where K is a compact subset of $\mathcal{E}$. Then :*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \left\{ \sup_{f\in\mathcal{G}_T} \Theta(f) \right\} = \sup_{f\in K} \Theta(f) \tag{3.4}$$

Corollary 1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5, we have*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \sup_{0\le x\le T-a_T} \frac{Z(x+A_T) - Z(x)}{A_T} = \gamma(1/c), \quad a.s. \tag{3.5}$$

where for any $x \ge 0$, we set $\gamma(x) := \sup\{z \ge 0 : \Psi(z) \le x\}$

Proof. Let $\Theta : (D(0,1), d_{\mathcal{U}}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the continuous functional defined by $\Theta(f) = f(1)$. Now, it follows from Lemma 3 that for any $c > 0$, $K_{1/c}$ is compact. Then, from Theorem 5, it is enough to prove that $\sup_{f\in K_{1/c}} f(1) = \gamma(1/c)$, which is a consequence of Jensen's inequality. □

The following theorem is obtained in (Frolov, 2008). Although the assumption on the mgf is weaker in this theorem, we obtain the same result for any $c > 0$, using large deviations methods.

Theorem 6. *Assume that $\Phi(u) < \infty$ in some neighborhood of the origin. Let $c_0 \ge 0$ be a constant defined by $1/c_0 = \sup\{\Psi(z) : \Psi(z) < \infty\}$. Set $A_T = c\log(T)$, for any $c > c_0$. Then, (3.5) holds.*

3.2 Examples

3.2.1 Continuous paths

Let $\{Z(t) : t \ge 0\}$ be a Levy process with continuous paths. We recall that in this case, $\{Z(t) : t \ge 0\}$ is a brownian motion with drift. Therefore, Theorem 7 yields an ERFL for $\{Z(t) : t \ge 0\}$, since it satisfies $(\mathcal{E})$ and $(\mathcal{C})$.

3.2.2 Compound Poisson process

Recall that given a sequence $\{Y_i : i \ge 1\}$ of i.i.d. r.v.'s. and a homogeneous, right continuous Poisson process $\{N(t) : t \ge 0\}$ which we assume to be independent of $\{Y_i : i \ge 1\}$, the compound Poisson process $\{S_N(t) : t \ge 0\}$ is defined by

$$S_N(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N(t)} Y_i \tag{3.6}$$

Denote by λ the parameter of the Poisson process $\{N(t) : t \ge 0\}$. Then, we recall that for any $t \ge 0$, we have

$$E[S_N(t)] = \lambda t E[Y_1] \qquad ; \qquad \Phi_{S_N(1)}(u) = \exp[\lambda(\Phi_{Y_1}(u) - 1)] \tag{3.7}$$

So, if $(\mathcal{C}_{Y_1})$ holds, then $\{S_N(t) : t \ge 0\}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{E})$ and $(\mathcal{C})$, and therefore an ERFL.

4 Proof

For any integers $n > 0$ and $l < n$, set

$$M_{n,l} := \{\eta_{m,l} : m \in \{0, ..., n-l\}\} \tag{4.1}$$

For any $c > 0$, set

$$a_n := \lfloor c \log n \rfloor \tag{4.2}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_n := \{\eta_{x,a_n} : 0 \leq x \leq n - a_n\} \tag{4.3}$$

For any integer j large enough, set $n_j := \max\{n : a_n = j\}$, so that $\exp(\frac{j}{c}) \leq n_j < \exp(\frac{j+1}{c})$. The series that we will consider will be indexed by j instead of n, in order to reduce their number of terms and therefore insure that they are convergent. This is classical in such situations. For $x \in [0, n_j - j]$, let k_x be the integer which is nearest to x (we choose $k_x = \lfloor x \log n \rfloor$ if $x \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$).

From Remark 1, it is enough to prove that for any $c > 0$, and $\epsilon > 0$, we have almost surely, for all T large enough :

$$\mathcal{G}_T \subset (K_{1/c})^\epsilon \text{ and } K_{1/c} \subset (\mathcal{G}_T)^\epsilon, \tag{4.4}$$

where for $L \subset D(0,1)$, $L^\epsilon := \{f \in D(0,1) : d_{\mathcal{U}}(f,g) < \epsilon \text{ for some} g \in L\}$. In the sequel, when it is not precised, the notation L^ϵ will be in the sense of the uniform distance. When we need to precise, we will denote $L^{\epsilon,\mathcal{U}}$ or $L^{\epsilon,\mathcal{S}}$ if it is in the sense of the uniform or the Skorohod distance.

We call the first statement in (4.4) the upper bound, while the second is called the lower bound. The reason is that for the first we use an upper bound in a functional LDP while we use a lower bound for the second.

4.1 The upper bound

Lemma 4. *Assume that $(\mathcal{C})$ and $(\mathcal{E})$ hold. Then, almost surely, there exists an integer $N(\epsilon)$ such that for all $n \geq N(\epsilon)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_n \subset (K_{1/c})^\epsilon \tag{4.5}$$

The proof will be achieved by proving the following lemmas. Throughout, we will denote simply by K the set $K_{1/c}$.

Lemma 5. *Assume that, for all $\epsilon > 0$, we have*

$$\sum_j P\left(M_{n_j,j} \not\subset K^\epsilon\right) < \infty \tag{4.6}$$

$$\sum_j n_j P\left(\sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq 1} |Z(\tau)| \geq j\epsilon\right) < \infty \tag{4.7}$$

Then almost surely, we have that (4.5) holds for all n large enough.

Proof. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have for all j large enough :

$$P\left(\mathcal{L}_{n_j} \not\subset K^\epsilon\right) \leq P\left(\left\{\mathcal{L}_{n_j} \not\subset K^\epsilon\right\} \cap \left\{M_{n_j,j} \subset K^{\epsilon/2}\right\}\right) + P\left(\left\{M_{n_j,j} \not\subset K^{\epsilon/2}\right\}\right) \tag{4.8}$$

Set $P_j := P\left(\left\{\mathcal{L}_{n_j} \not\subset K^{\epsilon/2}\right\} \cap \left\{M_{n_j,j} \subset K^{\epsilon}\right\}\right)$. Assume that the event $\left\{\left\{\mathcal{L}_{n_j} \not\subset K^{\epsilon}\right\} \cap \left\{M_{n_j,j} \subset K^{\epsilon/2}\right\}\right\}$ is realized. Consequently, there exists $\eta_{x,j} \in \mathcal{L}_{n_j}$, with $x \notin \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $g \in K^{\epsilon}$, we have that $\|\eta_{x,j}, g\| \geq \epsilon$. Now, there exists $g_{k_x} \in K^{\epsilon}$ such that $\|\eta_{k_x,j}, g_{k_x}\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Then, the triangle inequality implies that necessarily, $\|\eta_{x,j}, \eta_{k_x,j}\| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Therefore, we have that

$$P_j \leq P\left(\sup_{0\leq x\leq n_j-j}\left\{\|Z(x+j\cdot) - Z(k_x+j\cdot)\| + \|Z(x) - Z(k_x)\|\right\} \geq j\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \tag{4.9}$$

Now, for all $s \in [0,1]$, we have that $|(x+js) - (k_x+js)| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, so that :

$$\sup_{0\leq x\leq n_j-j}\sup_{0\leq s\leq 1}|Z(x+js) - Z(k_x+js)| \leq \sup_{0\leq y\leq n_j}\sup_{0\leq a\leq \frac{1}{2}}|Z(y+a) - Z(y)| \tag{4.10}$$

Consequently :

$$P_j \leq P\left(\sup_{0\leq x\leq n_j}\sup_{0\leq a\leq \frac{1}{2}}|Z(x+a) - Z(x)| \geq j\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right) \tag{4.11}$$

Let $0 < h < 1$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $R_n := [n/h] + 1$. Then, $\alpha_n := \frac{n}{R_n} \leq h$. For any $x \in [0,n]$ and $a \in [0,h]$, let i_x be the unique integer such that $i_x\alpha_n \leq x < (i_x+1)\alpha_n$. Then, two cases occur :

Case 1 : $x + a \leq (i_x+1)\alpha_n$.
Then, $\max\left\{|i_x\alpha_n - (x+a)|\,; |i_x\alpha_n - x|\right\} \leq h$, so that :

$$|Z(x+a) - Z(x)| \leq |Z(x+a) - Z\left(i_x\alpha_n\right)| + |Z\left(i_x\alpha_n\right) - Z(x)| \leq 2\max_{0\leq i\leq R_n}\sup_{0\leq\tau\leq h}|Z\left(i\alpha_n+\tau\right) - Z(i\alpha_n)| \tag{4.12}$$

Case 2 : $x + a > (i_x+1)\alpha_n$.
Then, $\max\left\{|(i_x+1)\alpha_n - (x+a)|\,; |(i_x+1)\alpha_n - i_x\alpha_n|\,; |i_x\alpha_n - x|\right\} \leq h$, so that :

$$|Z(x+a) - Z(x)| \leq |Z(x+a) - Z\left((i_x+1)\alpha_n\right)| + |Z\left((i_x+1)\alpha_n\right) - Z\left(i_x\alpha_n\right)| + |Z\left(i_x\alpha_n\right) - Z(x)| \tag{4.13}$$

$$|Z(x+a) - Z(x)| \leq 3\max_{0\leq i\leq R_n}\sup_{0\leq\tau\leq h}|Z\left(i\alpha_n+\tau\right) - Z(i\alpha_n)| \tag{4.14}$$

Therefore :

$$\sup_{0\leq x\leq n}\sup_{0\leq a\leq h}|Z(x+a) - Z(x)| \leq 3\max_{0\leq i\leq R_n}\sup_{0\leq\tau\leq h}|Z\left(i\alpha_n+\tau\right) - Z(i\alpha_n)| \tag{4.15}$$

Now, for all $u > 0$, we get from Fact 4 in Appendix that

$$P\left(\max_{0\leq i\leq R_n}\sup_{0\leq\tau\leq h}|Z\left(i\alpha_n+\tau\right) - Z(i\alpha_n)| > u\right) \leq R_nP\left(\sup_{0\leq\tau\leq 1}|Z\left(\tau\right)| > u\right) \tag{4.16}$$

Therefore, in view of (4.11) and (4.15), (4.16) with $n = n_j$ and $h = \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain that the series $\sum_j P_j$ is convergent. Now (4.6) implies that the series $\sum_j P\left(\mathcal{L}_{n_j} \not\subset K^{\epsilon}\right)$ is convergent and the Borel-Cantelli Lemma implies that $P\left(\mathcal{L}_{n_j} \not\subset K^{\epsilon} \text{ i.o. } (\text{in } j)\right) = 0$. Finally, we observe that, for all n satisfying $n_{j-1} < n \leq n_j$, we have that $\mathcal{L}_n \subset \mathcal{L}_{n_j}$. Consequently, the event $\{\mathcal{L}_n \not\subset K^{\epsilon} \text{ i.o. } (\text{in } n)\}$ is included in $\left\{\mathcal{L}_{n_j} \not\subset K^{\epsilon} \text{ i.o. } (\text{in } j)\right\}$, which concludes the proof. □

Then, we prove (4.6) when $(\mathcal{C})$ holds.

Lemma 6. *Assume that* $(\mathcal{C})$ *holds. Then, for any* $\epsilon > 0$*, the series* $\sum_j P\left(M_{n_j,j} \not\subset K^{\epsilon;\mathcal{U}}\right)$ *is convergent.*

Proof. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Since for all $c > 0$, $K_{1/c}$ is a compact subset of $(C(0,1),\mathcal{U})$, Fact 2 in Appendix implies that there exists $\zeta > 0$ such that

$$K^{\epsilon;\mathcal{U}} = \bigcup_{g\in K} B_{\mathcal{U}}(g,\epsilon) \supset \bigcup_{g\in K} B_{\mathcal{S}}(g,\zeta) = K^{\zeta;\mathcal{S}} \tag{4.17}$$

Let F be the complement in $D(0,1)$ of $K^{\zeta;\mathcal{S}}$. Therefore, for all $n > 0$, we have that

$$P\left(M_{n,a_n} \not\subset K^{\epsilon;\mathcal{U}}\right) \leq \sum_{m=0}^{n-a_n} P\left(\eta_{m,a_n} \in F\right) \leq nP\left(\frac{Z(a_n\cdot)}{a_n} \in F\right) \tag{4.18}$$

The last inequality is justified in Appendix (See Fact 3). Now, F being a closed subset of $(D(0,1),\mathcal{S})$, Theorem 4 implies that for any $\theta > 0$, we have for all n large enough :

$$P\left(M_{n,a_n} \not\subset (K_{1/c})^{\epsilon;\mathcal{U}}\right) \leq n\exp\left[a_n\left(-I(F)+\theta\right)\right] \tag{4.19}$$

Then, by Lemma 3, I is a good rate function. Therefore, applying Lemma 2 with $(\mathcal{E},d) = (D(0,1),d_{\mathcal{S}})$, we can write $I(\mathcal{F}_\epsilon) = \frac{1}{c} + \delta$ with $\delta > 0$. So applying (4.19) with $\theta = \frac{\delta}{4}$, we have for all n large enough :

$$P\left(M_{n,a_n} \not\subset K^{\epsilon;\mathcal{U}}\right) \leq n\exp\left(-a_n\left(\frac{1}{c}+\frac{3\delta}{4}\right)\right) \tag{4.20}$$

Applying this inequality with $n = n_j$, so that $a_n = j$, we obtain :

$$P\left(M_{n_j,j} \not\subset K^{\epsilon;\mathcal{U}}\right) \leq n_j\exp\left(-j\left(\frac{1}{c}+\frac{3\delta}{4}\right)\right) < \exp\left(\frac{j+1}{c}\right)\exp\left(-j\left(\frac{1}{c}+\frac{3\delta}{4}\right)\right) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{c}-j\frac{3\delta}{4}\right) \tag{4.21}$$

□

Now we prove (4.7). Recall that we may assume that the process $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is centered.

Lemma 7. *Assume that* $(\mathcal{C})$ *holds and that* $\{Z(t) : t \geq 0\}$ *is centered. Then, for all* $\epsilon > 0$*, we have*

$$\sum_j n_j P\left(\sup_{0\leq\tau\leq 1}|Z(\tau)| \geq j\epsilon\right) < \infty \tag{4.22}$$

Proof. For any fixed $s > 0$, we have that

$$P\left(\sup_{0\leq\tau\leq 1}|Z(\tau)| > u\right) \leq P\left(\sup_{0\leq\tau\leq 1}\exp(sZ(t)) > \exp(su)\right) + P\left(\sup_{0\leq\tau\leq 1}\exp(-sZ(t)) > \exp(su)\right) \tag{4.23}$$

The process being centered, it is a martingale. Now, the function $x \mapsto \exp(\pm sx)$ is nonnegative, continuous and convex. Therefore, the process $(\exp[\pm sZ(t)])_{t\geq 0}$ is a nonnegative submartingale. So, by Doob's inequality and assumption $(\mathcal{C})$, there exists $A_s < \infty$ such that

$$P\left(\sup_{0\leq\tau\leq 1}|Z(\tau)| > u\right) \leq \exp(-su)(\Phi(s)+\Phi(-s)) =: A_s\exp(-su) \tag{4.24}$$

Then, combining the preceding inequalities, we obtain that for all $u > 0$:

$$P\left(\sup_{0\leq x\leq n}\sup_{0\leq a\leq h}|Z(x+a)-Z(x)| > u\right) \leq R_nA_s\exp\left(-\frac{su}{3}\right) \tag{4.25}$$

Now, for all j large enough, observe that there exists $\beta > 0$ such that $R_{n_j} \leq \beta n_j$ (For example, take $\beta = \frac{2}{h}$). Therefore, we get from (4.25) that :

$$P\left(\sup_{0\leq x\leq n_j}\sup_{0\leq a\leq h}|Z(x+a)-Z(x)|>j\epsilon\right)\leq \beta n_j A_s \exp\left(-\frac{sj\epsilon}{3}\right)\leq \beta A_s \exp\left(\frac{j+1}{c}\right)\exp\left(-\frac{sj\epsilon}{3}\right) \tag{4.26}$$

Consequently :

$$P\left(\sup_{0\leq x\leq n_j}\sup_{0\leq a\leq h}|Z(x+a)-Z(x)|>u\right)\leq \beta A_s \exp\left(\frac{1}{c}\right)\exp\left[-j\left(\frac{s\epsilon}{3}-\frac{1}{c}\right)\right] \tag{4.27}$$

Now, by choosing s large enough so that $\frac{s\epsilon}{3} > \frac{1}{c}$, we conclude the proof. □

The end of the proof of the upper bound is deferred to the Appendix (See Lemma 10).

4.2 The lower bound

Lemma 8. *Let $c > 0$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have almost surely that for all n large enough :*

$$K_{1/c} \subset \mathcal{L}_n^{\epsilon}. \tag{4.28}$$

Proof. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. For any integer $n > 0$, set $R_n := [(n - a_n)/a_n]$ and $Q_n := \{\eta_{ra_n,a_n} : 1 \leq r \leq R_n\}$. Let $g \in K$ and set $G := B_{\mathcal{U}}(g, \epsilon/2)$. From Fact 2 in Appendix, there exists $\zeta > 0$ such that $G \supset G' := B_{\mathcal{S}}(g, \zeta)$. Therefore :

$$P\left(g\notin Q_n^{\epsilon/2}\right)=P\left(\bigcap_{1\leq r\leq R_n}\{\eta_{ra_n,a_n}\notin G\}\right)\leq P\left(\bigcap_{1\leq r\leq R_n}\{\eta_{ra_n,a_n}\notin G'\}\right) \tag{4.29}$$

Then, the mutual independence of the η_{ra_n,a_n} for $1 \leq r \leq R_n$ implies that :

$$P\left(g\notin Q_n^{\epsilon/2}\right)\leq\prod_{r=1}^{R_n}\left(1-P\left(\eta_{ra_n,a_n}\in G'\right)\right)=\left(1-P\left(\frac{Z(a_n\cdot)}{a_n}\in G'\right)\right)^{R_n} \tag{4.30}$$

Now, G' being $\mathcal{S}$-open, Theorem 3 implies that for all $\theta > 0$, we have for all n large enough :

$$P\left(\frac{Z(a_n\cdot)}{a_n}\in G'\right)\geq\exp\left(a_n\left(-I(G')-\theta\right)\right) \tag{4.31}$$

Since $I(f) = \infty$ for $f \notin C(0,1)$, we have $I(G') = I\left(G' \cap C(0,1)\right)$. Now, since the Skorohod topology relativized to $C(0,1)$ coincides with the uniform topology, we have that $G' \cap C(0,1)$ is an open subset of $(C(0,1),\mathcal{U})$ containing g. Therefore, there exists $\zeta' > 0$ such that $G'' := B'_{\mathcal{U}}(g, \zeta') \subset G' \cap C(0,1)$. Since $I(G') \leq I\left(G''\right)$, we have for all n large enough :

$$P\left(\frac{Z(a_n\cdot)}{a_n}\in G'\right)\geq\exp\left(-a_n\left(I\left(G''\right)+\theta\right)\right) \tag{4.32}$$

Now, we claim that $G'' \cap K \neq \varnothing$. Indeed, let $h \in K$. If $d_{\mathcal{U}}(h, g) < \zeta'$, then the claim is proved. Otherwise, consider the map $\phi : \alpha \in (0,1) \mapsto d_{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha g + (1-\alpha)h, g)$, which is clearly continuous, with $\phi(0) = d_{\mathcal{U}}(h, g)$ and $\phi(1) = 0$. Consequently, the intermediate value theorem implies that there exists

$\alpha_0 \in (0,1)$ such that $\phi(\alpha_0) = \frac{\zeta'}{2}$. Then, set $k_0 := \alpha_0 g + (1-\alpha_0)h \in G''$. Now, the strict convexity of I (which follows from that of Ψ) implies that $I(k_0) < \alpha_0 I(g) + (1-\alpha_0)I(h) \leq 1/c$. Consequently, $k_0 \in K$ and the claim is proved. So, let $k \in G'' \cap K$. Then the strict convexity of I implies that for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$, we have that $I(\alpha g + (1-\alpha)k) < 1/c$. Therefore, we can write $I(G'') = \frac{1}{c} - \delta$ with $\delta > 0$. Taking $\theta = \frac{\delta}{4}$ in (4.32), we obtain for all n large enough :

$$P\left(\frac{Z(a_n \cdot)}{a_n} \in G'\right) \geq \exp\left(-a_n\left(\frac{1}{c} - \frac{3\delta}{4}\right)\right) \geq n^{-\left(1-c\frac{3\delta}{4}\right)} \tag{4.33}$$

Consequently, for all n large enough :

$$P\left(g \notin Q_n^{\epsilon/2}\right) \leq \left(1 - n^{-\left(1-c\frac{3\delta}{4}\right)}\right)^{(n-a_n)/a_n} \leq \left(1 - n^{-\left(1-c\frac{3\delta}{4}\right)}\right)^{\frac{n}{c\log n}} \tag{4.34}$$

$$P\left(g \notin Q_n^{\epsilon/2}\right) \leq \exp\left(-n^{-\left(1-c\frac{3\delta}{4}\right)}\frac{n}{c\log n}\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{n^{c\frac{3\delta}{4}}}{c\log n}\right) \tag{4.35}$$

Therefore, the Borel-Cantelli lemma implies that :

$$P\left(g \notin Q_n^{\epsilon/2} \text{ i.o. (in n)}\right) = 0 \tag{4.36}$$

Now, since K is a compact subset of $(C(0,1),\mathcal{U})$, we can find $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and functions $(g_q)_{q=1,\ldots,d}$ in K such that $K \subset \bigcup_{q=1}^d B'_{\mathcal{U}}(g_q, \epsilon/2) \subset \bigcup_{q=1}^d B_{\mathcal{U}}(g_q, \epsilon/2)$. Then, the triangle inequality and (4.36) applied to each g_q imply that there exists almost surely an integer $N(\epsilon)$ such that for all $n \geq N(\epsilon)$:

$$K \subset Q_n^{\epsilon} \subset \mathcal{L}_n^{\epsilon}. \tag{4.37}$$

□

The end of the proof of the lower bound is deferred to the Appendix (See Lemma 11).

5 Appendix

5.1 Proof of remark 2

We denote by $\Psi^{(\mu)}$ the Legendre transform of the moment-generating function of $Z^{(\mu)}(1)$. We obtain readily that for all real a, $\Psi^{(\mu)}(a) = \Psi(a-\mu)$.
For $x \geq 0$ and $l > 0$, let $\eta_{x,l}^{(\mu)}(\cdot)$ be the standardized increment functions, defined on [0,1] by

$$\eta_{x,l}^{(\mu)}(s) := \frac{Z^{(\mu)}(x+sl) - Z^{(\mu)}(x)}{l} = \eta_{x,l}(s) + \mu s \tag{5.1}$$

For $T > 0$, let A_T be a function of T with $0 < A_T \leq T$ and such that A_T and TA_T^{-1} are non-decreasing. We define the set of Erdős-Rényi-type increment functions associated to $Z^{(\mu)}(\cdot)$ by

$$\mathcal{G}_T^{(\mu)} := \left\{\eta_{x,A_T}^{(\mu)} : 0 \leq x \leq T - A_T\right\} \tag{5.2}$$

Let $I^{(\mu)}$ be the functional defined on $D[0,1]$ by

$I^{(\mu)}(f) = \int_0^1 \Psi^{(\mu)}(\dot{f}(u))du$ if f is absolutely continuous and $f(0) = 0$, while $I^{(\mu)}(f) = \infty$ otherwise.

For any $\alpha > 0$, set $K_\alpha^{(\mu)} := \left\{f \in D(0,1) : I^{(\mu)}(f) \leq \alpha\right\}$. We easily check that $K_\alpha^{(\mu)} = K_\alpha + \mu I_d$.

Lemma 9. *Assume that for some A_T and α, we have almost surely :*

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \Delta\left(\mathcal{G}_T, K_\alpha\right) = 0 \tag{5.3}$$

Then, for all real μ, we have almost surely :

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \Delta\left(\mathcal{G}_T^{(\mu)}, K_\alpha^{(\mu)}\right) = 0 \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. The assumption and a translation argument imply that for all $\epsilon > 0$, almost surely, for all T large enough :

$$\mathcal{G}_T^{(\mu)} = \mathcal{G}_T + \mu I_d \subset \left(K_\alpha + \mu I_d\right)^\epsilon = \left(K_\alpha^{(\mu)}\right)^\epsilon \tag{5.5}$$

$$K_\alpha^{(\mu)} = K_\alpha + \mu I_d \subset \left(\mathcal{G}_T + \mu I_d\right)^\epsilon = \left(\mathcal{G}_T^{(\mu)}\right)^\epsilon \tag{5.6}$$

□

5.2 The Skorohod space

We present some general results on the space $D(0,1)$. In particular, we justify that our result is reduced to the large deviations of the distributions $(P_\lambda)_{\lambda>0}$. Let $C(0,1)$ be the set of continuous functions on $[0,1]$. For any $f \in C(0,1)$, let w_f the modulus of continuity of f, defined by

$$w_f(\delta) = \sup_{|s-t|\le\delta} |f(s) - f(t)| \tag{5.7}$$

Fact 2. *Let K be a compact subset of $(C(0,1),\mathcal{U})$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\zeta > 0$ such that for all $g \in K$,*

$$B_{\mathcal{U}}(g,\epsilon) \supset B_{\mathcal{S}}(g,\zeta). \tag{5.8}$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$. By the Arzela-Ascoli theorem, there exists $\delta > 0$ with

$$\sup_{g\in K} w_g(\delta) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \tag{5.9}$$

Set $\zeta := \min\left\{\delta; \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}$. For all $g \in K$ and $h \in B_{\mathcal{S}}(g,\zeta)$, there exists $\nu_h \in \Lambda$ satisfying

$$\|\nu_h - I\| < \zeta \le \delta \text{ and } \|h - g.\nu_h\| < \zeta \le \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \tag{5.10}$$

Then :

$$\|g.\nu_h - g\| \le w_g(\|\nu_h - I\|) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \tag{5.11}$$

$$\|h - g\| \le \|h - g.\nu_h\| + \|g.\nu_h - g\| < \epsilon. \tag{5.12}$$

□

Fact 3. *Let $x \ge 0$. Then, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$, we have*

$$P\left((Z(x+\cdot) - Z(x)) \in B\right) = P\left(Z(\cdot) \in B\right). \tag{5.13}$$

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(t_i)_{1\leq i\leq k}$ with $0 \leq t_1 < ... < t_k \leq 1$. Let $\pi_{(t_i)}$ be the natural projection from $D(0,1)$ to $\mathbb{R}^k$ defined by $\pi_{(t_i)}(f) = (f(t_i))$. Since Z has independent and stationary increments, for all Borel subset H of $\mathbb{R}^k$, we have :

$$P\left((Z(x+\cdot) - Z(x)) \in \pi_{(t_i)}^{-1}(H)\right) = P\left((Z(x+t_i) - Z(x))_i \in H\right) = P\left((Z(t_i)))_i \in H\right) = P\left(Z(\cdot) \in \pi_{(t_i)}^{-1}(H)\right). \tag{5.14}$$

Finally, we conclude by Theorem 12.5 of (Billingsley, 1999), which asserts that if the laws of two processes valued in $D(0,1)$ agree on all sets of the form $\pi_{(t_i)}^{-1}(H)$, then they agree on the whole of $\mathcal{S}$. □

Fact 4. *For all $x \geq 0$ and $u > 0$, we have :*

$$P\left(\sup_{0\leq s\leq 1} |Z(x+s) - Z(x)| > u\right) = P\left(\sup_{0\leq s\leq 1} |Z(s)| > u\right) \tag{5.15}$$

Proof. Let $(s_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of $\mathbb{Q}\cap[0,1]$. Since any $f \in D(0,1)$ is right-continuous, we have :

$$P\left(\sup_{0\leq s\leq 1} |Z(x+s) - Z(x)| > u\right) = P\left((Z(x+\cdot) - Z(x)) \in \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \{f \in D(0,1) : |f(s_k)| > u\}\right) \tag{5.16}$$

Now, we get from Section 12 of (Billingsley, 1999) that for any $s \in [0,1]$, the map $f \in D(0,1) \mapsto f(s)$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Therefore, $\left\{\bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \{f \in D(0,1) : |f(s_k)| > u\}\right\} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$, so we conclude by applying the preceding Lemma. □

5.3 End of proofs of main results

Denote by I_d the identity function on $[0,1]$. Fix λ_0 with $0 < \lambda_0 < 1$.

Fact 5. *For any $f \in K$, we define the function ρ_f by :*

$$\rho_f(\lambda) = \left\|\lambda^{-1} f(\lambda I_d) - f\right\| \tag{5.17}$$

Then ρ_f is uniformly continuous on $[\lambda_0, 1]$.

Proof. For any $\lambda, \mu \in [\lambda_0, 1]$, we have that

$$\left|\left\|\lambda^{-1} f(\lambda I_d) - f\right\| - \left\|\mu^{-1} f(\mu I_d) - f\right\|\right| \leq \left\|\lambda^{-1} f(\lambda I_d) - \mu^{-1} f(\mu I_d)\right\| \tag{5.18}$$

$$\left\|\lambda^{-1} f(\lambda I_d) - \mu^{-1} f(\mu I_d)\right\| \leq \left\|\lambda^{-1} f(\lambda I_d) - \lambda^{-1} f(\mu I_d)\right\| + \left\|\lambda^{-1} f(\mu I_d) - \mu^{-1} f(\mu I_d)\right\| \tag{5.19}$$

Then, we have :

$$\left\|\lambda^{-1} f(\lambda I_d) - \lambda^{-1} f(\mu I_d)\right\| \leq \lambda_0^{-1} \sup_{f\in K} w_f(|\lambda - \mu|) \tag{5.20}$$

$$\left\|\lambda^{-1} f(\mu I) - \mu^{-1} f(\mu I_d)\right\| \leq \left|\lambda^{-1} - \mu^{-1}\right| \sup_{f\in K} \|f\| \tag{5.21}$$

Now, K being $\mathcal{U}$-compact, we apply the Arzela-Ascoli theorem to conclude. □

Fact 6. *For any $g, h \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, 1]$, we have :*

$$\left\|\lambda^{-1} g(\lambda I_d) - g\right\| \leq (1 + \lambda_0^{-1}) \|h - g\| + \left\|\lambda^{-1} h(\lambda I_d) - h\right\| \tag{5.22}$$

Proof. For any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, 1]$, we have :

$$\left\|\lambda^{-1} g(\lambda I_d) - g\right\| \leq \left\|\lambda^{-1} g(\lambda I_d) - \lambda^{-1} h(\lambda I_d)\right\| \leq + \left\|\lambda^{-1} h(\lambda I_d) - h\right\| + \|h - g\| \tag{5.23}$$

Since $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, we get readily :

$$\left\|\lambda^{-1} g(\lambda I_d) - \lambda^{-1} h(\lambda I_d)\right\| \leq \lambda_0^{-1} \|h - g\| \tag{5.24}$$

□

Fact 7. *For all $\delta > 0$, there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $|\lambda - 1| < \gamma$ implies that*

$$\sup_{g \in K} \left\|\lambda^{-1} g(\lambda I_d) - g\right\| < \delta. \tag{5.25}$$

Proof. Fix $\alpha > 0$. Then K is $\mathcal{U}$-compact so that there exists a finite number of functions $(g_q)_{q=1,...,d}$ in K such that $K \subset \bigcup_{q=1}^{d} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{U}}(g_q, \alpha)$. Now, we obtain from Fact 5 that the functions $(\rho_{g_q})_{q=1,...,d}$ are continuous at $\lambda = 1$. Therefore, for all $\kappa > 0$, there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $|\lambda - 1| < \gamma$ implies that for all $q \in \{1, ..., d\}$, $\left\|\lambda^{-1} g_q(\lambda I_d) - g_q\right\| < \kappa$. We assume that $|\lambda - 1| < \gamma$. For any $g \in K$, there exists $q \in \{1, ..., d\}$ such that $g \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}(g_q, \alpha)$ and we deduce from (5.22) that

$$\left\|\lambda^{-1} g(\lambda I_d) - g\right\| \leq \alpha(1 + \lambda_0^{-1}) + \kappa \tag{5.26}$$

Finally, for any $\delta > 0$, we can choose γ and α small enough to get that $\alpha(1 + \lambda_0^{-1}) + \kappa < \delta$. □

Fact 8. *For all $\delta > 0$, there exist $\theta = \theta(\delta)$, with $0 < \theta < \delta$, and $\gamma > 0$ such that $|\lambda - 1| < \gamma$ implies that*

$$\sup_{f \in K^\theta} \left\|\lambda^{-1} f(\lambda I_d) - f\right\| < \delta. \tag{5.27}$$

Proof. Fix any $\theta > 0$. For all $f \in K^\theta$, let $g \in K$ such that $\|g - f\| < \theta$. Then (5.22) implies that

$$\left\|\lambda^{-1} f(\lambda I_d) - f\right\| \leq \theta \left(1 + \lambda_0^{-1}\right) + \sup_{g \in K} \left\|\lambda^{-1} g(\lambda I_d) - g\right\| \tag{5.28}$$

So we conclude by applying Fact 7 and by observing that $1 + \lambda_0^{-1} > 1$. □

Lemma 10. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists almost surely a real $T(\epsilon)$ such that for all real $T \geq T(\epsilon)$, we have that $\mathcal{G}_T \subset K^\epsilon$.*

Proof. For any $T > 0$, set $n_T := \inf\{n : a_n \geq A_T\}$. Notice that necessarily, $n_T \geq T$. Now, the Mean value theorem implies that $a_{n_T} - A_T \leq \frac{c}{T}(n_T - T)$, so there exists $\tau > 0$ such that for all $T \geq \tau$, $T - A_T \leq n_T - a_{n_T}$. Furthermore, the definition of n_T implies that $a_{n+1} < A_T$ and we prove readily that $\frac{A_T}{a_{n_T}}$ converges to 1 as $T \to \infty$.

Fix $\epsilon > 0$.

From Fact 8, there exist $\theta, \gamma > 0$ such that $|\lambda - 1| < \gamma$ implies that $\sup_{f \in K^\theta} \left\|\lambda^{-1} f(\lambda I_d) - f\right\| < \epsilon/2$. Let $T_0 > 0$ such that for all $T \geq T_0$, $\left|\frac{A_T}{a_{n_T}} - 1\right| < \gamma$.

Then, let $T(\epsilon) := \max\{\tau; T_0; N(\theta)\}$, where $N(\theta)$ is as in the conclusion of Lemma 4. Now let T be any real satisfying $T \geq T(\epsilon)$. Then for all $x \in [0, T - A_T] \subset [0, n_T - a_{n_T}]$, and for all $s \in [0, 1]$, we have that

$$\eta_{x,T,A_T}(s) = \frac{a_{n_T}}{A_T} \; \eta_{x,n_T,a_{n_T}}\left(s \frac{A_T}{a_{n_T}}\right) \tag{5.29}$$

Now, the choice of $T(\epsilon)$ implies that, for all $x \in [0, n_T - a_{n_T}]$, $\eta_{x,n_T,a_{n_T}} \in K^\theta$ and consequently :

$$\left\| \frac{a_{n_T}}{A_T} \ \eta_{x,n_T,a_{n_T}} \left(\frac{A_T}{a_{n_T}} I_d \right) - \eta_{x,n_T,a_{n_T}} \right\| < \epsilon/2 \tag{5.30}$$

Now, as $\theta < \epsilon/2$, we have that $K^\theta \subset K^{\epsilon/2}$. Therefore, the triangle inequality implies that for all $x \in [0, T - A_T]$, $\eta_{x,T,A_T} \in K^\epsilon$. □

Lemma 11. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists almost surely a real $T(\epsilon)$ such that for all $T \geq T(\epsilon)$, we have :*

$$K \subset \mathcal{G}_T^\epsilon. \tag{5.31}$$

Proof. For all $T \geq c$, we have that $1 \leq T - A_T$, so $T \geq c$ then $m_T := \max\{n : n \leq T \text{ and } n - a_n \leq T - A_T\}$ exists. The definition of m_T implies that $m_T + 1 - a_{m_T+1} > T - A_T$. We deduce readily that $\frac{m_T}{T}$ and therefore $\frac{a_{m_T}}{A_T}$ converges to 1 as $T \to \infty$.

Fix $\epsilon > 0$.

Lemma 8 implies that there exists almost surely an integer $N_1(\epsilon/2)$ such that for all $n \geq N_1(\epsilon/2)$, we have that $K \subset \mathcal{L}_n^{\epsilon/2}$. Since $m_T \longrightarrow \infty$ as $T \to \infty$, we can find $T_1(\epsilon/2) > 0$ such that for all $T \geq T_1(\epsilon/2)$, we have that $K \subset \mathcal{L}_{m_T}^{\epsilon/2}$.

Then for all $x \in [0, m_T - a_{m_T}] \subset [0, T - A_T]$, and all $s \in [0, 1]$, we have :

$$\eta_{x,a_{m_T}}(s) = \frac{A_T}{a_{m_T}} \ \eta_{x,A_T} \left(s \frac{a_{m_T}}{A_T} \right) \tag{5.32}$$

Notice that $\frac{a_{m_T}}{A_T} \leq 1$. So, from Fact 8, there exist $\gamma > 0$ and $\theta = \theta(\epsilon) > 0$, such that $|\lambda - 1| < \gamma$ implies that $\sup_{f \in K^\theta} \left\| \lambda^{-1} f(\lambda I_d) - f \right\| < \epsilon/2$. Let $T_1 > 0$ such that for all $T \geq T_1$, $\left| \frac{a_{m_T}}{A_T} - 1 \right| < \gamma$. From Lemma 10, there exists almost surely $T(\theta) > 0$ such that for all real $T \geq T(\theta)$, we have that $\mathcal{G}_T \subset K^\theta$.

Then, set $T(\epsilon) := \max\{c, T_1(\epsilon/2); T_1; T(\theta)\}$. Therefore, for any real $T \geq T(\epsilon)$ and $x \in [0, T - A_T]$, we have that $\eta_{x,A_T} \in K^\theta$ and thus

$$\left\| \frac{A_T}{a_{m_T}} \ \eta_{x,A_T} \left(\frac{a_{m_T}}{A_T} I_d \right) - \eta_{x,A_T} \right\| < \epsilon/2 \tag{5.33}$$

Consequently, for all $x \in [0, m_T - a_{m_T}] \subset [0, T - A_T]$, we have that $\left\| \eta_{x,a_{m_T}} - \eta_{x,A_T} \right\| < \epsilon/2$ and we conclude by the triangle inequality. □

References

Bertoin, J. (1998). *Levy Processes.* Cambridge University Press.

Billingsley, P. (1999). *Convergence of probability measures. Second edition.* Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics : Probability and Statistics.

Borovkov, K.A. (1990). *A functional form of the Erdös-Rényi law of large numbers.* Theory Probab. Appl. 35, no. 4, 762-766.

Chernoff, H. (1952). *A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations*. Ann. Math. Statistics 23, 493-507.

Cramer, H. (1937). *Sur un nouveau theoreme limite de la theorie des probabilites*. Colloquium on Theory of Probability. Herman, Paris.

Deheuvels, P. (1991). *Functional Erdös-Rényi laws*. Studia Scientiarum Mathematicarum Hungarica 26, 261-295.

Deheuvels, P. (2007) *Topics on empicial processes*. EMS, Zürich, 2007, 93-190

Deheuvels, P. and Mason, D. (1993). *Random fractals generated by oscillations of processes with stationary and independent increments*. Probability in Banach Spaces, 9, Birkhäuser.

Frolov, A. N. (2008). *Unified limit theorems for increments of processes with independent increments*. Theory Probab. Appl. Vol. 49, No. 3, 531-540.

Sanchis, G. (2002). *A functional limit theorem for Erdös and Rényi's law of large numbers*. Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 98, 1-5 (1994).

Revesz, P. (1979). *A generalization of Strassen's functional law of the iterated logarithm*. Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete 50, 257-264.

Varadhan, S.R.S. (1966). *Asymptotic probabilities and differential equations*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 19, 261-286.